

DOCKET NUMBER: 1636-0021-0/rm

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
Kenichi HIRAOKA

SERIAL NUMBER: 09/547,223 : GROUP: 1761

FILED: April 11, 2000 : EXAMINER: A. L. CORBIN
RCE FILED: January 14, 2003

FOR: METHOD OF PREVENTING BROWNING OR DARKENING OF FISH AND
METHOD OF TREATING BROWNEED OR DARKENED FISH

LETTER


Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

On May 31, 2001, we filed an Information Disclosure Statement listing reference
us 4,060,644. Submitted herewith is the Chinese Office Action where this reference was cited
for the Examiner's consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration Number: 24,618

Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082



22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 10/98)

RECEIVED
MAR 13 2003
GROUP 1700

1761

MAR 1 2003

THE STATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

CCPIT Patent and Trademark Law Office
8th Floor, 2 Fuchengmenwai Street,
Beijing 100037, China

Li, Binwei
Examiner

Seal of the
Examination
Department

Application No.:	00118051.7	Examination Dept.	4
Attorney	Zhang, Min		Date of Notification:
Applicant:	KENICHI HIRAOKA		Date: 20 Month: 12 Year: 2002
Title of the Invention:	method of preventing browning or darkening of fish and method of treating browned or darkened fish		

RECEIVED

Notification of the First Office Action

MAR 13 2003

GROUP 1700

1. ☒ The applicant requested examination as to substance on Apr 3, 2002 and examination has been carried out on the above-identified patent application for invention under Article 35(1) of the Patent Law of the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as "the Patent Law").
☐ The Chinese Patent Office has decided to examine the application on its own initiative under Article 35(2) of the Patent Law.
2. ☒ The applicant claimed priority/priorities based on the application(s):
 filed in JP on Apr 30, 1999, filed in _____ on _____,
 filed in JP on May 11, 1999, filed in _____ on _____,
 filed in JP on May 17, 1999, filed in _____ on _____,
☒ The applicant has provided the priority documents certified by the Patent Office where the priority application(s) was/were filed.
☐ The applicant has not provided the priority documents certified by the Patent Office where the priority application(s) was/were filed and therefore the priority claim(s) is/are deemed not to have been made under Article 30 of the Patent Law.
☐ The application is a PCT continuation.
3. ☐ The applicant submitted amendments to the application on _____ and on _____, wherein the amended _____ submitted on _____ and the amended _____ submitted on _____ are not acceptable, because said amendments do not comply with ☐ Article 33 of the Patent Law. ☐ Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.
 The specific reasons why the amendments are not allowable are set forth in the text portion of this Notification.
4. ☒ Examination as to substance was directed to the initial application documents as filed.
☐ Examination as to substance was directed to the documents as specified below:
 claims _____, pages _____ of the description and drawings _____ filed on the date of filing,
 claims _____, pages _____ of the description and drawings _____ submitted on _____,
 claims _____, pages _____ of the description and drawings _____ submitted on _____,
 and the abstract submitted on _____.
5. ☐ This Notification is issued without search reports.
☒ This Notification is issued with consideration of the search results.
☒ Below is/are the reference document(s) cited in this Office Action (the reference number(s) will be used throughout the examination procedure):

Address: 6 Xi Tu Cheng Lu, Haidian, Beijing

Post Code: 100088

No.	Number(s) or Title(s) of Reference(s)	Date of Publication (or the filing date of conflicting application)
1	US4060644	Date: <u>29</u> Month: <u>11</u> Year: <u>1977</u>
2		Date: __ Month: __ Year: __
3		Date: __ Month: __ Year: __
4		Date: __ Month: __ Year: __
5		Date: __ Month: __ Year: __

6. Conclusions of the Action:

- ☐ On the Specification:
- ☐ The subject matter contained in the application is not patentable under Article 5 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ The description does not comply with Article 26 paragraph 3 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ The draft of the description does not comply with Rule 18 of the Implementing Regulations.
- ☒ On the Claims:
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are not patentable under Article 25 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with the definition of inventions prescribed by Rule 2 paragraph 1 of the Implementing Regulations.
 - ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 6 does/do not possess the novelty as required by Article 22 paragraph 2 of the Patent Law.
 - ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4 does/do not possess the inventiveness as required by Article 22 paragraph 3 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not possess the practical applicability as required by Article 22 paragraph 4 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with Article 26 paragraph 4 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with Article 31 paragraph 1 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with the provisions of Rules 20-23 of the Implementing Regulations.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with Article 9 of the Patent Law.
 - ☐ Claim(s) _____ does/do not comply with the provisions of Rule 12 paragraph 1 of the Implementing Regulations.

7. In view of the conclusions set forth above, the Examiner is of the opinion that:

- ☐ The applicant should make amendments as directed in the text portion of the Notification.
- ☐ The applicant should expound in the response reasons why the application is patentable and make amendments to the application where there are deficiencies as pointed out in the text portion of the Notification, otherwise, the application will not be allowed.
- ☒ The application contains no allowable invention, and therefore, if the applicant fails to submit sufficient reasons to prove that the application does have merits, it will be rejected.

8. The followings should be taken into consideration by the applicant in making the response:

- (1) Under Article 37 of the Patent Law, the applicant should respond to the office action within 4 months counting from the date of receipt of the Notification. If, without any justified reason, the time limit is not met, the application shall be deemed to have been withdrawn.
- (2) Any amendments to the application should be in conformity with the provisions of Article 33 of the Patent Law. Substitution pages should be in duplicate and the format of the substitution should be in conformity with the relevant provision contained in "The Examination Guidelines".
- (3) The response to the Notification and/or revision of the application should be mailed to or handed over to the "Reception Division" of the Patent Office, and documents not mailed or handed over to the Reception Divisions have no legal effect.
- (4) Without an appointment, the applicant and/or his agent shall not interview with the Examiner in the Patent Office.

9. This Notification contains a text portion of 1 pages and the following attachments:

- ☒ 1 cited reference(s), totaling 4 pages. ☐